

Research on the efficacy of different insecticides to control the green peach aphid (*Myzus persicae*), the black bean aphid (*Aphis fabae*) and Beet Mild Yellowing Virus (BMYV) in the Netherlands in 2020

Elma Raaijmakers (IRS)



20R12 Niet bestemd voor publicatie



Research on the efficacy of different insecticides to control the green peach aphid (*Myzus persicae*), the black bean aphid (*Aphis fabae*) and Beet Mild Yellowing Virus (BMYV) in the Netherlands in 2020

Elma Raaijmakers (IRS)

Stichting IRS Postbus 20 4671 VA Dinteloord Telefoon: +31 (0)165 – 51 60 70 E-mail: irs@irs.nl Internet: http://www.irs.nl

Niets uit deze uitgave mag worden verveelvoudigd en/of openbaar gemaakt door middel van druk, fotokopie, microfilm of op welke wijze ook zonder voorafgaande schriftelijke toestemming van de uitgever.

No part of this book may be reproduced in any form by print, photoprint, microfilm or any other means without written permission from the publisher.

Het IRS stelt zich niet aansprakelijk voor eventuele schadelijke gevolgen die kunnen ontstaan bij gebruikmaking van de gegevens uit deze uitgave.

©IRS 2020 Project: 11-02

CONTENTS

SAN	MENVA	TTING	3
SUN	MMARY	7	4
1.	INTRO	DDUCTION	5
2.	MATE	RIALS AND METHODS	6
2		L SITES	
		OF PRODUCTS	
		LING	
		CULATION WITH APHIDS	
		LICATION OF TREATMENTS	
		ID DESTRUCTION	
		DASSESSMENT	
		LYSIS OF DATA	
3.	RESUI	LTS AND DISCUSSION 1	0
3	.1 Effe	CT ON APHIDS	0
	3.1.1	Effect on green peach aphid (Myzus persicae)	0
	3.1.2	Effect on black bean aphid (Aphis fabae)	
-		ECT ON BEET MILD YELLOWING VIRUS (BMYV) 1	
-		ECT ON PHYTOTOXICITY	
3		ECT ON YIELD 1	
4.	CONC	LUSIONS1	6
5.	LITER	ATURE1	7
AN	NEX A	GEP CERTIFICATE IRS 1	8
AN	NEX B	LOCATION FIELD TRIAL	1
AN	NEX C	TRAIL SCHEME	2
AN	NEX D	GENERAL FIELD DATA	3
AN	NEX E	RAW DATA MYZUS PERSICAE	4
AN	NEX F	RAW DATA APHIS FABAE	8
AN	NEX G	RAW DATA OTHER APHIDS	2
AN	NEX H	RAW DATA BENEFICIALS	4
AN	NEX I	RAW DATA PLANT NUMBERS AND VIRUS YELLOWS	
AN	NEX J	RAW DATA PHYTOTOXICITY	
		WEATHER DATA	
AN	NEX L	RAW DATA YIELD ASSESSMENT 4	5

Samenvatting

Vergelingsziektevirus wordt overgebracht door bladluizen, waarvan de groene perzikluis (*Myzus persicae*) de meeste efficiënte vector is. Er zijn drie soorten vergelingsziektevirussen: Beet Yellows Virus (BYV), Beet Chlorotic Virus (BChV) en Beet Mild Yellowing Virus (BMYV). De virussen kunnen worden beheerst door de bladluizen te bestrijden. Doel van dit onderzoek is de effectiviteit bepalen van verschillende soorten insecticiden voor de bestrijding van groene perzikluis om BMYV te beheersen. Omdat de zwarte bonenluis van nature ook voorkwam in de proef, is het effect op deze bladluissoort ook meegenomen in dit onderzoek. Er is een proefveld aangelegd in Westmaas waarbij groene perzikluizen, die vooraf geïnfecteerd waren met BMYV, op 14 mei 2020 (50 dagen na zaai) werden uitgezet. Dit is een veel hogere infectiedruk met virus dan de natuurlijke infectiedruk waarbij slechts maximaal 1% van de bladluizen besmet is. Vijf dagen na de inoculatie zijn de verschillende bespuitingen uitgevoerd.

Op basis van dit proefveld kunnen de volgende conclusies worden getrokken:

- IRS 800, Sumicidin Super en IRS 781 waren niet effectief in de beheersing van *Myzus persicae*, *Aphis fabae* en BMYV.
- Teppeki, IRS 770, IRS 810, Batavia, IRS 765, IRS 785 (alle doseringen) en IRS 811 waren effectief in de beheersing van *Myzus persicae* en BMYV hadden geen significant lagere opbrengst dan de niet-geïnoculeerde controle.
- Teppeki, IRS 810, IRS 765, IRS 785 (0.2 kg/ha) en IRS 785 (0.5 kg/ha) waren effectief in de beheersing van *Aphis fabae* (zes dagen na toepassing).

Summary

Virus yellows is an important disease in sugar beet. Virus yellows is caused by the viruses Beet Yellows Virus (BYV), Beet Chlorotic Virus (BChV) en Beet Mild Yellowing Virus (BMYV), which can cause up to 50%, 30% and 35% yield reduction, respectively. In 2018 and 2019, in diagnostic samples from all over the Netherlands mainly BChV and BMYV were detected by IRS. These two viruses can be transmitted by different aphids. The green peach aphid (*Myzus persicae*) is the most important vector. Since the black bean aphid (*Aphis fabae*) was also present in the field trial, the effect on this aphid was investigated in this research as well.

Different insecticides were compared with a treatment without insecticide.

Therefore a field trial was conducted in Westmaas. In this trial green peach aphids, infected with BMYV, were inoculated in sugar beet in the 6-8 leaf stage (BBCH 12-18) at the 14th of May 2020 (50 days after sowing). This is a higher infection level in comparison with a natural situation. Normally, less than 1% of the green peach aphids is infected with virus, in the field trials it was 100%. Five days after inoculation, the plots were sprayed with the different treatment.

The aim was to study the efficacy of different insecticides on the control of BMYV, the green peach aphid (*Myzus persicae*) and the black bean aphid (*Aphis fabae*). From this trial it can be concluded that:

- IRS 800, Sumicidin Super and IRS 781 were not effective in the control of *Myzus persicae*, *Aphis fabae* and BMYV.
- Teppeki, IRS 770, IRS 810, Batavia, IRS 765, IRS 785 (all dosages) and IRS 811 were all effective in the control of *Myzus persicae* and BMYV and did not show a significantly lower sugar yield than the non-inoculated control.
- Teppeki, IRS 810, IRS 765, IRS 785 (0.2 kg/ha) and IRS 785 (0.5 kg/ha) were effective in the control of *Aphis fabae* (six days after application).

1. Introduction

Virus yellows is an important disease in sugar beet. Virus yellows is caused by the viruses Beet Yellows Virus (BYV), Beet Chlorotic Virus (BChV) and Beet Mild Yellowing Virus (BMYV), which can cause up to 50%, 30% and 35% yield reduction, respectively. In 2018 and 2019, in diagnostic samples from all over the Netherlands mainly BChV and BMYV were detected by IRS. These two viruses can be transmitted by different aphids. The green peach aphid (*Myzus persicae*) is the most important vector. BChV and BMYV are transmitted persistently, meaning that once an aphid acquires the virus, it stays infectious for its whole life. The spread of the virus in a sugar beet field can be controlled by controlling aphids with insecticides. Also the black bean aphid (*Aphis fabae*) can cause problems in sugar beet. This aphid has a much higher damage threshold, since damage to sugar beets is mainly caused by feeding from the leaves and it hardly transmits viruses. Because this is a dominant species in sugar beet, it is also taken into account in this research.

The study was conducted under Good Experimental Practises (GEP, Annex A).

2. Materials and methods

2.1 Trial sites

The field trial was conducted in a sugar beet field in Westmaas, the Netherlands (Annex B).

2.2 List of products

Table 1 gives an overview of the treatments used in this study. Sugar beet seeds of the variety Caprianna KWS (8K815) were treated and delivered by KWS (Einbeck, D.). All seeds (also the untreated control) were treated with fungicides Vibrance SB (0.74 g fludioxonil, 0.5g sedaxane and 0.5g metalaxyl-m per 100.000 seeds) and Tachigaren (14.7 g hymexazol per 100.000 seeds) and the insecticide Force (10 g tefluthrin per 100.000 seeds) to prevent influences of fungi and soil pests on plant establishment. Tefluthrin does not have any effect on green peach or black bean aphids.

number	treatment	rate
1	not inoculated	*
2	untreated control	-
3	Teppeki (flonicamid)	0.14 kg/ha
4	IRS 770	0.25 l/ha
5	IRS 810	0.2 l/ha
6	Batavia (spirotetramat)	0.45 l/ha
7	IRS 765	0.1 l/ha
8	IRS 785	0.25 kg/ha
9	IRS 785	0.20 kg/ha
10	IRS 785	0.125 kg/ha
11	IRS 785	0.5 kg/ha
12	IRS 811	0.25 kg/ha
13	IRS 800 + 0.25% Addit (adjuvant)	3.0 kg/ha
14	Sumicidin Super (esfenvalerate)	0.2 l/ha
15	IRS 781	0.12%

 Table 1.
 Overview of treatments in the field trial in Westmaas, 2020 (trial code: 20-11-02.01). Times of application can be found in table 2.

*this treatment was sprayed with Teppeki (0.14 kg/ha) to prevent damage by naturally occurring aphids on the 19th of May, 2020.

2.3 Drilling

Drilling was done with a precision sowing machine (Monosem Mecca 2000) adapted for sowing of field trials. Sowing distance within the rows was 18.0 cm and 50 cm between rows. The field trial was sown on 25 March, 2020. The trial was designed as randomised blocks in four replications (Annex C). Gross plot size: 3 meters wide (6 rows) and 15.5 meters long. Nett plot size: 3 meters wide (6 rows) and 12 meters long. To prevent spread of aphids and virus to neighbouring plots, six rows of sugar beet were sown between the treated plots, which were sprayed with Teppeki (flonicamid; 0.14 kg/ha) one day before inoculation with green peach aphids. General field data can be found in Annex D.

2.4 Inoculation with aphids

Prior to inoculation, number of natural occurring aphids were counted in plots of treatments 1, 2, 3 and 8 to 12 on twelve plants per plot (plant numbers 5, 10, 15, 20, 25 and 30 starting at the beginning of row 2 and at the end of row 5) on the 13th of May, 2020 (BBCH 12-18) (Annex E). To obtain a homogenous distribution of virus yellows, the trial was inoculated with reared green peach aphids.

In September 2019, sugar beets with Beet Mild Yellowing Virus (BMYV) were collected from a sugar beet field in Rilland (Netherlands; IRS diagnostic sample 19-526). These sugar beets were potted in a mixture of 50% sand (sand from the river Maas; Vriends de Schelde BV, Bergen op Zoom, NL) and 50% potting soil (Primasta Flower Power, Primasta BV, Asten, NL) (v/v), watered and placed in the climate chambers at IRS (Dinteloord). Climate room conditions were 23 °C for 16 h in light (LED 119 mmol/m²/s, RAZRx PLUS, Fluence Bioengineering, Austin, Texas, USA) and 16 °C for 8 h in dark. Virus free green peach aphids (originally obtained from the Laboratory of Entomology of Wageningen University and Research (Wageningen, the Netherlands) in 2018) were transferred to the leaves of the infected sugar beets. After 48 hours these aphids were collected and transferred to six week old sugar beet plants (grown in 700 ml pots with the same mixture as described above; variety Kleist, Strube GmbH, Söllingen, Germany) in the climate chambers and placed in an aphid rearing cage. Every three to four weeks, leaves with aphids were cut off and transferred to new, six weeks old plants to maintain the culture of green peach aphids (and BMYV) in the climate chambers. This resulted in an 100% infected aphid population for inoculation in the field.

The field trial was inoculated with the reared green peach aphids carrying BMYV on 14th of May, 2020 (50 days after sowing; BBCH 12-18). For field inoculation, leaves with aphids from the plants in aphid rearing cages in the climate chambers were cut off and carefully transported to the field trials in small boxes. Three plants in row 2 and three plants in row 5 of each plot were inoculated with ten aphids per plant, by transferring the aphids using a small paint brush. Plant numbers 5, 15 and 25, counting from the beginning of row 2 and from the end of row 5, were inoculated.

One day before inoculation (13th of May) the field (except for the trial plots) was sprayed with Teppeki (0,14 kg/ha) to prevent spread of aphids over the field.

2.5 Application of treatments

Treatment 2 was the untreated control. Treatments 1 and 3 to 14 were sprayed on the 19th of May, 2020, five days post inoculation. Insecticides were applied with a broadcast application, where the entire area of each plot was treated. Applications of these treatments were conducted by Wageningen Plant Research (WPR; location Westmaas), using a CHD field trial sprayer (system Van der Wey, with Lechler Nozzle 120-02 at 3.0 bar and 400 liter spraying solution per hectare) to apply the different treatments. These nozzles had a 75% drift reduction at the pressure used (TCT, 2019).

Treatment 13 was also sprayed on the 12th and 29th of May and the 4th of June. Treatment 15 had to be sprayed during the day under dry conditions and was therefore sprayed separately with the hand sprayer (with Nozzle TeeJet XR 11003 at 3.0 bar and 400 liter spraying solution per hectare) on the 19th of May by Wageningen Plant Research. These nozzles also had a 75% drift reduction at the pressure used (TCT, 2019).

parameter	treatment 13 (12 May)	treatment 1 and 3-14 (19 May)	treatment 15 (19 May)	treatment 13 (29 May)	treatment 13 (4 June)
application time	14.00 h.	7.30 h.	14.00 h.	8.45 h.	9.00 h.
application duration (minutes)	10	30	10	10	10
temperature (°C)	20	15	20	13	14
relative humidity (RV)	44	70	65	70	78
wind speed	2 km/h	6 km/h	9 km/h	7 km/h	9 km/h
wind direction	North West	West	West	North East	North West

Table 2.Conditions during spraying at the field trial in Westmaas, 2020.

2.6 Assessment of efficacy

The effect of the different treatments on inoculated green peach aphids and natural occurring black bean aphids was measured by counting the number of aphids in all plots on twelve plants per plot (plant numbers 5, 10, 15, 20, 25 and 30 starting at the beginning of row 2 and at the end of row 5 1 day after application (20th of May), 6-7 days after application (25th and 26th of May), 14-15 days after application (2nd and 3rd of June) and 22-23 days after application (10th and 11th of June). On the same plants, the number of other aphids and the number of beneficials (e.g. eggs, larvae and adults of ladybird beetles, soldier beetles, spiders, parasitic wasps, hoverflies, lacewings) was counted as well (data only shown in Annexes). The effect on BMYV was measured by counting the number of plants with yellowing symptoms per plot 7 (6th of July), 12 (11th of August) and 17 weeks (11th of September) after inoculation.

2.7 Aphid destruction

After the assessment on the effect on the number of aphids, the whole field (including the trial plots) was sprayed with Batavia SC (spirotetramat; 0,45 L/ha; 23^{rd} of June, 2020) to control the aphids and to prevent that aphids and viruses were spread to the neighbouring farmer fields.

2.8 Yield assessment

The field trial was harvested on 18^{th} of September, 2020 with the six row sugar beet harvester of IRS (PASSI), which is adapted to harvest field trials. From each plot the gross weight of the plot was measured by this harvester and of each plot a subsample of 60-80 kilogram was taken to the tare house of Cosun Beet Company (Dinteloord, NL) for analysis of sugar beet quality. In the tare house, the subsample was divided into two samples, in which soil tare, sugar-, potassium-, sodium-, amino nitrogen content and content of glucose was determined. Nett weight was calculated by subtracting soil tare from gross weight. Based on the quality assessments and nett weight, sugar yield and financial yield were calculated, based on 35 ϵ /ton sugar beets with 17% sugar, taking quality (WIN) and soil tare into account. Financial yield in this report is presented as gross financial yield. Costs of spraying and crop protection products are not taken into account.

2.9 Analysis of data

Since data of aphid counts were non-normal distributed, these data were log transformed before statistical analysis.

treatment/n in untreated control))*100. This was not done for the treatments 13 to 15, since they were not effective in the control of aphids and Abbott assumes that an insecticide is efficient in its analysis. Data were analysed by ANOVA using Fisher Protected LSD. Analyses were done with Genstat Software Package 19.0.

3. Results and discussion

3.1 Effect on aphids

Percentage mortality by Abbott's formula were not calculated for the treatments 13 to 15, since they were not effective in the control of aphids and Abbott assumes that an insecticide is efficient in its analysis. Data are shown in this report, but results are discussed based on number of aphids.

3.1.1 Effect on green peach aphid (*Myzus persicae*)

There was no significant difference in the number of natural occurring green peach aphids at the 13^{th} of May before application of the treatments (P = 0.776) (table 3; Annex E) between the treatments.

One day after treatment (20 May), IRS 785 (0.2 kg/ha) had significantly the lowest numbers of *Myzus persicae*, although this was not significantly different from the not inoculated control, IRS 770, Batavia, IRS 811 and all other dosages of IRS 785. Only IRS 785 (0.2 kg/ha) had significantly lower numbers of *Myzus persicae* than the untreated control. Six days after treatment (25 May), IRS 785 (0.2 kg/ha) still had the lowest numbers of *Myzus persicae*, although this was not significantly different from IRS 810, IRS 765, IRS 811, IRS 785 (0.25 kg/ha) and IRS 785 (0.5 kg/ha). IRS 765, IRS 785 (0.25 kg/ha) and IRS 785 (0.2 kg/ha). IRS 765, IRS 785 (0.25 kg/ha) and IRS 785 (0.2 kg/ha). IRS 765, IRS 785 (0.25 kg/ha) and IRS 785 (0.2 kg/ha). Sumicidin Super and IRS 781 were significantly more effective than the untreated control. IRS 800, Sumicidin super and IRS 781 are all contact insecticides and with the current spraying techniques it is very hard or even impossible to reach the green peach aphids, which are present at the underside of the leaves and curly leaf edges.

Fourteen days after treatment (2 June), the uninoculated control, IRS 765, IRS 785 (0.25 kg/ha), IRS 785 (0.20 kg/ha), IRS 785 (0.5 kg/ha) and IRS 811 had significantly less green peach aphids compared to the untreated control.

22 Days after treatment (10 June) IRS 785 (0.125 kg/ha) and IRS 810 had significantly less green peach aphids than the untreated control. Although it was significant, it is remarkable that the lowest dosage of IRS 785, which performed less compared to the other dosages of IRS 785, had the lowest number of effect on the green peach aphids.

	applied on the 12	of total	inst time							
	treatment	Ν	lumber oj	f green pe	peach aphids (Myzus persicae) per 12 plants					
		13 May	20 May		25 M	25 May		2 June		une
1	not inoculated	48.7	91.9	abcde	10.1	b	10.3	d	5.0	bcde
2	untreated control	99.2	105.9	abcd	80.5	a	37.1	abc	16.2	bcd
3	Teppeki	77.7	138.0	abc	11.2	b	14.3	cd	5.1	bcde
4	IRS 770	-	89.4	abcde	8.1	bc	18.8	bcd	4.6	cde
5	IRS 810	-	108.1	abcd	2.6	bcd	15.6	bcd	2.8	e
6	Batavia	-	91.5	abcde	11.1	b	15.6	bcd	4.0	de
7	IRS 765	-	174.0	ab	1.8	cd	10.5	d	3.2	de
8	IRS 785 (0.25 kg/ha)	54.1	61.7	cde	1.9	cd	10.7	d	5.0	bcde
9	IRS 785 (0.2 kg/ha)	93.0	40.3	e	0.8	d	8.9	d	6.1	bcde
10	IRS 785 (0.125 kg/ha)	78.1	84.3	bcde	6.5	bc	16.5	bcd	1.1	e
11	IRS 785 (0.5 kg/ha)	98.3	48.9	de	4.4	bcd	6.6	d	5.0	cde
12	IRS 811	53.3	61.8	cde	4.2	bcd	7.9	d	6.0	bcde
13	IRS 800 + 0.25% Addit	-	214.3	а	134.8	а	89.6	а	20.5	ab
14	Sumicidin Super	-	211.8	а	134.8	а	76.8	а	25.0	a
15	IRS 781	-	161.6	ab	63.6	а	45.6	ab	16.9	abc
Р		0.776	0.0	09	< 0.00	01	< 0.00	01	<0.0	001
Sig	nificance	not significant	signif	ïcant	very sign	ificant	very sign	ificant	very sig	nificant

Table 3.Number of green peach aphids (*Myzus persicae*) per twelve plants at the field trial in Westmaas
(2020). Treatments were applied on the 19^{th} of May (except for IRS 800 + 0.25% Addit, which was
applied on the 12^{th} of May for the first time).

* Virus infected *Myzus persicae* was inoculated on 14th of May.

Table 4.Insecticide efficiency (calculated with Abbott's formula) of the different treatments on the control of
green peach aphids (*Myzus persicae*) compared to the untreated control at the field trial in Westmaas
(2020). Treatments were applied on the 19th of May (except for IRS 800 + 0.25% Addit, which was
applied on the 12th of May for the first time).

	treatment	Perce	ntage mortality con	npared to untreated	l control
	ireaimeni	20 May	25 May	2 June	10 June
1	not inoculated	28.7	74.3 ab	63.8	55.9 b
2	untreated control	0.0	0.0 c	0.0	0.0 c
3	Teppeki	12.2	73.1 ab	59.1	57.6 ab
4	IRS 770	28.1	84.2 a	46.4	61.6 ab
5	IRS 810	16.8	88.1 a	50.2	64.8 ab
6	Batavia	21.6	55.1 b	45.1	67.3 ab
7	IRS 765	0.0	96.5 a	52.9	58.2 ab
8	IRS 785 (0.25 kg/ha)	41.1	96.9 a	61.6	59.4 ab
9	IRS 785 (0.20 kg/ha)	53.8	97.4 a	68.1	53.8 b
10	IRS 785 (0.125 kg/ha)	34.7	86.9 a	48.0	92.0 a
11	IRS 785 (0.5 kg/ha)	46.2	85.0 a	57.1	55.5 b
12	IRS 811	38.7	94.2 a	66.1	53.2 b
13	IRS 800 + 0.25% Addit	-	-	-	-
14	Sumicidin Super	-	-	-	-
15	IRS 781	-	-	-	-
Р		0.100	< 0.001	0.074	0.013
Sigi	nificance	not significant	very significant	not significant	significant

3.1.2 Effect on black bean aphid (Aphis fabae)

There was no significant difference between the treatments in the number of natural occurring green peach aphids at 13 May before application of the treatments (P = 0.118) and one day after application (20 May) (table 5; Annex F).

Six days after treatment (25 May), IRS 810 (0.2 kg/ha) had the lowest numbers of *Aphis fabae*, although this was not significantly different from Teppeki, IRS 770, Batavia, IRS 765, IRS 785 (all dosages) and IRS 811. Only Teppeki, IRS 810, IRS 765, IRS 785 (0.2 kg/ha) and IRS 785 (0.5 kg/ha) had a significantly lower number of *Aphis fabae* than the untreated control. Sumicidin Super had the highest number of *Aphis fabae*, although this was not significantly different from the untreated control and IRS 800.

Fourteen days after treatment (2 June), Batavia had the lowest numbers of *Aphis fabae*, but this was not significantly different with IRS 765, IRS 785 (0.2 kg/ha). Treatments with Batavia, IRS 765 and IRS 785 (0.2 kg/ha) resulted in significantly less *Aphis fabae* compared to the untreated control.

22 Days after treatment (10 June), Teppeki, Batavia and IRS 785 (0.2 kg/ha) had significantly less *Aphis fabae* than the untreated control.

	treatment		umber of black be	an aphid	s (Aphi	s fabae) p	er 12 p	lants	
	treatment	13 May	20 May	20 May 25 May		2 Jui	ne	10 Ju	ne
1	not inoculated	275.1	229.7	8.7	bc	8.2	bcd	20.9	bc
2	untreated control	224.4	107.4	48.0	ab	38.5	bc	69.5	ab
3	Teppeki	102.5	170.0	4.3	c	7.4	bcd	6.6	с
4	IRS 770		69.3	7.9	bc	16.6	bcd	14.0	bc
5	IRS 810		300.3	3.4	c	12.5	bcd	14.9	bc
6	Batavia		266.3	10.9	bc	3.1	d	5.4	с
7	IRS 765		242.2	3.9	c	4.1	d	12.0	bc
8	IRS 785 (0.25 kg/ha)	99.5	91.7	4.9	bc	12.8	bcd	18.6	bc
9	IRS 785 (0.20 kg/ha)	68.3	22.8	1.4	c	4.5	d	7.7	с
10	IRS 785 (0.125 kg/ha)	102.0	92.5	12.7	bc	6.7	bcd	11.3	bc
11	IRS 785 (0.5 kg/ha)	164.6	99.0	2.4	с	6.3	cd	35.2	bc
12	IRS 811	124.3	96.1	10.5	bc	10.4	bcd	24.1	bc
13	IRS 800 + 0,25% Addit		337.1	189.1	а	51.8	ab	20.2	bc
14	Sumicidin Super		294.8	246.2	а	303.1	а	284.1	а
15	IRS 781		77.9	15.6	bc	37.5	bc	41.4	abc
Р		0.118	0.089	0.0	01	0.00)5	0.04	18
~.	1.7	not							
Sig	nificance	significant	not significant	signifi	cant	signifi	cant	signifi	cant

Table 5.Number of black bean aphids (*Aphis fabae*) per twelve plants at the field trial in Westmaas (2020).Treatments were applied on the 19th of May (except for IRS 800 + 0.25% Addit, which was applied on the 12th of May for the first time).

Table 6.Insecticide efficiency (calculated with Abbott's formula) of the different treatments on the control of
black bean aphids (*Aphis fabae*) compared to the untreated control at the field trial in Westmaas
(2020). Treatments were applied on the 19th of May (except for IRS 800 + 0.25% Addit, which was
applied on the 12th of May for the first time).

	treatment	Percentag	e mortalit	у сотра	ared to un	treate	d control	
	ireaimeni	20 May	25 N	Iay	2 Jur	ne	10 Ju	ne
1	not inoculated	24.5	59.0	abc	72.5	a	57.3	ab
2	untreated control	0.0	0.0	d	0.0	b	0.0	c
3	Teppeki	18.1	73.5	abc	61.6	a	70.0	ab
4	IRS 770	45.9	59.9	abc	46.4	a	66.9	ab
5	IRS 810	23.3	59.9	abc	51.8	a	63.8	ab
6	Batavia	14.8	68.4	abc	71.4	a	83.1	а
7	IRS 765	22.2	60.3	abc	69.3	a	67.0	ab
8	IRS 785 (0.25 kg/ha)	22.9	76.9	abc	47.2	a	65.3	ab
9	IRS 785 (0.20 kg/ha)	62.8	98.0	a	65.4	a	86.5	а
10	IRS 785 (0.125 kg/ha)	36.9	47.9	c	53.7	a	47.4	ab
11	IRS 785 (0.5 kg/ha)	38.9	91.5	ab	67.0	a	40.8	b
12	IRS 811	36.2	53.3	bc	59.8	a	46.2	ab
13	IRS 800 + 0.25% Addit	-	-		-		-	
14	Sumicidin Super	-	-		-		-	
15	IRS 781	-	-		-		-	
Р		0.127	0.00	05	0.03	6	0.01	6
Sig	nificance	not significant	signifi	icant	signific	cant	signifi	cant

3.2 Effect on Beet Mild Yellowing Virus (BMYV)

The effect of the treatments on the symptoms of BMYV was measured on the 6th of July, 11th of August and 11th of September, 2020.

On all assessment dates, there was only a very low number of plants with virus yellows symptoms in the non-inoculated control (treatment 1; table 7, Annex I).

On the 6th of July, Sumicidin Super had the highest percentage of plants with symptoms of virus yellows. However, this was not significantly different from the percentage of plants with symptoms of virus yellows in the untreated control, IRS 800 and IRS 781. Teppeki, IRS 810, IRS 765, IRS 785 (all dosages) and IRS 811 had significantly less plants with virus yellows than the untreated control, although this was not significantly different from IRS 770 and Batavia. Effect on BMYV corresponds well with the effect on *Myzus persicae*. On the 11th of August and the 11th of September, treatments 3 to 12 all had a significantly lower percentage of plants with symptoms of virus yellows than the untreated control. None of the treatments 4 to 12 were significantly different from Teppeki. IRS 800, Sumicidin Super and IRS 781 were on both assessment dates not significantly better than the untreated control.

	treatment	Perce	ntage d	of plants with s	ymptoms	s of virus yellov	WS		
	in commenti	6 July	,	11 Au	gust	11 Septe	ember		
1	not inoculated	0.1	d	0.3	d	0.8	d		
2	untreated control	10.0	ab	15.3	а	22.6	ab		
3	Teppeki	5.2	c	6.9	bc	9.8	с		
4	IRS 770	6.0	bc	6.3	bc	13.2	с		
5	IRS 810	4.9	c	5.2	bc	11.8	с		
6	Batavia	5.8	bc	8.1	b	14.2	bc		
7	IRS 765	3.4	c	5.2	bc	8.8	с		
8	IRS 785 (0.25 kg/ha)	4.1	c	7.8	bc	13.0	с		
9	IRS 785 (0.20 kg/ha)	4.4	c	6.1	bc	11.1	с		
10	IRS 785 (0.125 kg/ha)	4.5	c	4.5	с	9.9	с		
11	IRS 785 (0.5 kg/ha)	5.3	c	6.7	bc	10.7	с		
12	IRS 811	4.1	c	7.4	bc	11.3	с		
13	IRS 800 + 0.25% Addit	10.9	а	19.3	a	26.2	а		
14	Sumicidin Super	12.9	а	16.8	a	26.4	а		
15	IRS 781	12.8	a	19.7	a	28.0	a		
Р		< 0.001		< 0.0	01	< 0.001			
Sig	nificance	very signif	ïcant	very sign	nificant	very sign	very significant		

Table 7. Percentage of plants with symptoms of virus yellows at the field trial in Westmaas (2020).

3.3 Effect on phytotoxicity

No symptoms of phytotoxicity were observed in any of the treatments at any date (Annex J).

3.4 Effect on yield

At Westmaas, there was a significant effect of treatment on sugar weight, sugar content and financial yield (Table 8; Annex L). This was as expected, since it is known that virus yellows, can reduce sugar yield.

Sugar beets treated with IRS 800 and Sumicidin Super had a significantly lower percentage of sugar than the untreated control. There was no significant difference between the untreated control and the other treatments.

IRS 785 (0.125 kg/ha) had the highest sugar yield, although this was not significantly different from the uninoculated control, Teppeki, IRS 770, IRS 810, Batavia, IRS 765, all other dosages of IRS 785 and IRS 811. Only IRS 785 (0.125 kg/ha) and the uninoculated control had a significantly higher sugar weight than the untreated control.

	treatment	root weight (t/ha)	sugar co (%		sugar wei	ght (t/ha)	financial yield (€/ha)	
1	not inoculated	121.7	16.24	a	19.8	а	3922	ab
2	untreated control	112.8	15.98	ab	18.0	bcde	3534	bcde
3	Teppeki	117.7	16.13	ab	19.0	abc	3759	abc
4	IRS 770	118.7	16.07	ab	19.1	abc	3754	abc
5	IRS 810	120.6	16.28	a	19.7	ab	3913	ab
6	Batavia	114.0	16.24	a	18.5	abcd	3678	abcd
7	IRS 765	117.1	16.30	а	19.1	abc	3804	ab
8	IRS 785 (0.25 kg/ha)	117.5	16.20	а	19.0	abc	3763	abc
9	IRS 785 (0.20 kg/ha)	116.8	16.17	ab	18.9	abcd	3751	abc
10	IRS 785 (0.125 kg/ha)	122.8	16.41	а	20.2	а	4045	а
11	IRS 785 (0.5 kg/ha)	117.0	16.03	ab	18.8	abcd	3698	abc
12	IRS 811	116.9	16.18	а	18.9	abcd	3727	abc
13	IRS 800 + 0.25% Addit	111.1	15.53	с	17.3	de	3292	de
14	Sumicidin Super	107.0	15.48	с	16.6	e	3148	e
15	IRS 781	112.3	15.74	bc	17.7	cde	3399	cde
Р		0.067	0.001		0.010		0.003	
LSI	0 5%	-	0.434		1.72		395.9	
Sig	nificance	not significant	signifi	cant	signif	icant	significant	

Table 8. Root weight (ton/ha), sugar percentage, sugar weight (ton/ha) and financial yield (€/ha) for each treatment at the field trial in Westmaas (18th of September, 2020).

4. Conclusions

The aim was to study the efficacy of different insecticides on the control of Beet Mild Yellowing Virus (BMYV), the green peach aphid (*Myzus persicae*) and the black bean aphid (*Aphis fabae*). From this trial it can be concluded that:

- IRS 800, Sumicidin Super and IRS 781 were not effective in the control of *Myzus persicae*, *Aphis fabae* and BMYV.
- Teppeki, IRS 770, IRS 810, Batavia, IRS 765, IRS 785 (all dosages) and IRS 811 were all effective in the control of *Myzus persicae* and BMYV and did not show a significantly lower sugar yield than the non-inoculated control.
- Teppeki, IRS 810, IRS 765, IRS 785 (0.2 kg/ha) and IRS 785 (0.5 kg/ha) were effective in the control of *Aphis fabae* (six days after application).

5. Literature

Raaijmakers, E. (2020). Research on the efficacy of different insecticides to control the green peach aphid (*Myzus persicae*), the black bean aphid (*Aphis fabae*) and Beet Chlorosis Virus (BChV) in the Netherlands in 2019. IRS, Dinteloord, pp 42.

Technische Commissie Techniekbeoordeling (2019). Lijst met indeling van spuitdoppen in DriftReducerende Dop-klassen (DRD-klassen). Versie 1 juli 2019. <u>https://www.sklkeuring.nl/media/files/DRD%20Lijst%201%20juli%202019.pdf</u>.

Annex A GEP CERTIFICATE IRS



Annex

Stichting IRS is officially recognised as being competent to carry out efficacy trials/tests in the following categories:

> Outdoor crops of sugar beet and cichory

This annex has been approved by H.A. Harmsma LL M, Bsc

Chief Inspector of the Food and Consumer Product Safety Authority

CERTIFICATE NUMBER: NL_GEP_04149620

Page 2 of 2

Due to COVID-19 pandemic, the recognition of efficacy testing could not be renewed before June 19, 2020. Therefore, a temporary certificate was issued.



Netherlands Food and Consumer Product Safety Authority Ministry of Agriculture, Nature and Food Quality

Certificate

of Official Recognition of Efficacy Testing Organisations in the Netherlands This certifies that, in conformity with the request of March 26, 2014

STICHTING IRS

Residing: Kreekweg 1, Dinteloord, the Netherlands

has officially been recognised as an organisation for efficacy testing in the Netherlands.

As has been laid down in the 'Regeling gewasbeschermingsmiddelen en blociden' (Regulation Crop Protection Products and Blocides) of September 26, 2007 (Staatscourant 2007, 386).

This recognition commences on: June 19, 2020 and expires on: December 19,2020

The above organisation is competent to carry out efficacy trials/tests in the categories mentioned in the annex of this certificate.

Utrecht, May 19, 2020

For the Minister of Agriculture, Nature and Food Quality,

Ø Ton van Arnhem

Director NPPO (National Plant Protection Organization)

CERTIFICATE NUMBER: NL_GEP_04200620

Page 1 of 2

Annex B Location field trial

IRS trial field 20-11-02.01 GPS location: 51.7892716, 4.4315667



Annex C Trail scheme

Nun	ll field nber d t size	of rep	olicat	ions:		We 4 12×	stmaa 3	S	Gr	OSS S	ize (1	n):			1	5.5×	3	
C										D								
15		3		11		14		6		13		4		8		10		5
9		1		4		13		12		14		15		2		11		7
8	le (9m)	5	(3 m)	2	(3m)	7	ie (9m)	10		1	(3m)	6	ie (9m)	3	(3m)	9	(3m)	12
7	tramline (9m)	13	7.0	10	gross (3m)	3	tramline (9m)	4	gross (3m)	12	gross (3m)	5	tramline (9m)	15	gross (1	gross (3m)	8
12		14		15		1		9		7		11		6		2		13
5		8		6		2		11		10		14		9		4		3
A										B								

Annex D General field data

soil type:	marine soil (clay loam) 2.6% organic matter pH-KCl = 7.3 % CaCO ₃ = 5.7 % silt: 24 % lutum: 15 K-value = 19
preceding crop:	 2019 winter wheat followed by green manure crop 2018 potatoes 2017 grass seeds 2016 grass seeds 2015 winter barley 2014 winter wheat
drilling date:	25 March 2020
variety:	Caprianna KWS (KWS, Einbeck, Germany)
distance in row:	18.0 cm
distance between rows:	50 cm

Annex E Raw data Myzus persicae

	westr	naas (2020).			
tuaatmaat	nonligato	Nı	umber of M	yzus persica	e per 12 pla	ants
treatment	replicate	13 May	20 May	25 May	2 June	10 June
1	А	25	32	23	5	10
1	В	7	35	8	6	2
1	С	145	343	4	12	7
1	D	200	182	13	29	4
2	А	45	199	85	35	37
2	В	94	18	43	29	5
2	С	186	496	483	121	75
2	D	122	68	23	15	4
3	А	203	273	26	13	3
3	В	2	73	14	15	3
3	С	239	254	4	26	20
3	D	260	71	10	8	3
4	А	*	179	13	6	5
4	В	*	73	5	22	1
4	С	*	90	8	26	15
4	D	*	54	8	34	4
5	А	*	179	3	10	1
5	В	*	29	0	15	4
5	С	*	213	3	23	6
5	D	*	122	10	17	2
6	А	*	171	66	33	4
6	В	*	7	0	3	0
6	С	*	440	10	18	15
6	D	*	119	28	28	7
7	А	*	272	4	20	3
7	В	*	40	0	10	4
7	С	*	535	3	4	3
7	D	*	155	2	14	3
8	А	38	124	2	11	7
8	В	9	25	0	12	4
8	С	117	196	7	9	10
8	D	199	23	2	11	2
9	А	59	51	1	5	7
9	В	49	18	4	22	7
9	С	169	112	0	13	12
9	D	152	25	0	4	2
10	А	131	142	24	25	4
10	В	15	53	8	7	1
10	С	192	184	6	15	1
10	D	95	36	1	27	0

Table E.1.Number of green peach aphids (*Myzus persicae*) per 12 plants at the field trial in
Westmaas (2020).

treatment	replicate	Nı	umber of M	yzus persica	e per 12 pla	ants
ireuimeni	терисие	13 May	20 May	25 May	2 June	10 June
11	А	116	126	13	0	5
11	В	21	20	19	43	5
11	С	173	105	2	6	11
11	D	217	21	0	10	2
12	А	130	256	5	5	12
12	В	3	33	3	6	2
12	С	151	136	9	9	11
12	D	108	12	2	14	4
13	А	*	485	406	73	38
13	В	*	46	47	65	4
13	С	*	354	99	50	10
13	D	*	264	173	270	99
14	А	*	272	374	90	41
14	В	*	129	50	71	7
14	С	*	471	101	154	84
14	D	*	121	173	35	15
15	А	*	212	151	113	64
15	В	*	164	30	22	5
15	С	*	340	64	71	37
15	D	*	57	56	24	6

*These plots were not counted on the 13th of May.

	contro	ol, the mortality			• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •
			en peach aphid		
treatment	replicate	20 May	25 May	2 June	10 June
1	А	84	73	86	73
1	В	0	81	79	60
1	С	31	99	90	91
1	D	0	43	0	0
2	А	0	0	0	0
2	В	0	0	0	0
2	С	0	0	0	0
2	D	0	0	0	0
3	А	0	69	63	92
3	В	0	67	48	40
3	С	49	99	79	73
3	D	0	57	47	25
4	А	10	85	83	86
4	В	0	88	24	80
4	С	82	98	79	80
4	D	21	65	0	C
5	А	10	96	71	97
5	В	0	100	48	20
5	С	57	99	81	92
5	D	0	57	0	50
6	А	14	22	6	89
6	В	61	100	90	100
6	С	11	98	85	80
6	D	0	0	0	C
7	A	0	95	43	92
7	В	0	100	66	20
7	C	0	99	97	2° 96
7	D	0	91	7	25
8	A	38	98	69	81
8	В	0	100	59	20
8	C	60	99	93	87
8	D	66	91	27	50
9	A	74	99	86	81
9	B	0	91	24	01
9	D C	77	100	24 89	84
9	D	63	100	73	50
10	A	29	72	29	89
10		29 0	72 81	29 76	80
10	B	63	81 99	76 88	80 99
	C				
10	D	47	96	0	100

 Table E.2.
 Mortality (%) of green peach aphids (*Myzus persicae*) according to Abbott's formula at the field trial in Westmaas (2020). When a specific plot had more aphids then the control, the mortality was set on 0.

		Mortality green peach aphids (Myzus persicae) (%)							
treatment	replicate	20 May	25 May	2 June	10 June				
11	А	37	85	100	86				
11	В	0	56	0	0				
11	С	79	100	95	85				
11	D	69	100	33	50				
12	А	0	94	86	68				
12	В	0	93	79	60				
12	С	73	98	93	85				
12	D	82	91	7	0				

Annex F Raw data Aphis fabae

Table F.1.	Number of black bean aphids (Aphis fabae) per 12 plants at the field trial in
	Westmaas (2020).

			Number of A	Aphis fabae	per 12 plan	ts
treatment	replicate	13 May	20 May	25 May	2 June	10 June
1	А	310	21	7	14	62
1	В	233	423	12	0	9
1	С	259	818	0	21	22
1	D	306	370	83	21	15
2	А	401	1094	731	320	408
2	В	125	10	19	2	18
2	C	199	318	130	97	185
2	D	253	35	2	25	16
3	А	75	300	8	0	2
3	В	58	137	10	24	25
3	С	102	467	3	21	13
3	D	248	43	1	8	2
4	A	*	50	13	23	43
4	В	*	56	11	11	3
4	С	*	37	1	7	10
4	D	*	221	18	41	25
5	А	*	558	1	7	66
5	В	*	74	11	8	23
5	C	*	177	3	26	7
5	D	*	1105	3	16	4
6	А	*	445	112	1	10
6	В	*	172	2	6	10
6	С	*	424	1	6	6
6	D	*	155	29	2	1
7	А	*	347	2	9	34
7	В	*	89	11	10	17
7	С	*	253	1	0	8
7	D	*	438	7	5	4
8	А	118	94	1	19	36
8	В	60	19	8	7	7
8	С	112	349	65	5	41
8	D	123	110	0	37	11
9	А	49	18	3	4	23
9	В	37	4	1	8	3
9	С	29	23	3	1	59
9	D	403	140	0	9	0
10	А	64	202	55	0	1
10	В	103	52	38	81	22
10	С	94	108	1	1	19
10	D	175	64	7	21	24

treatment	replicate		Number of A	Aphis fabae	per 12 plan	ets
ireuimeni	терисие	13 May	20 May	25 May	2 June	10 June
11	А	244	400	19	6	73
11	В	42	38	6	5	17
11	С	339	25	0	10	45
11	D	208	246	0	5	27
12	А	62	133	6	4	33
12	В	144	90	14	13	23
12	С	457	454	81	23	13
12	D	58	15	1	9	34
13	А	*	614	573	15	92
13	В	*	34	12	23	1
13	С	*	621	131	17	0
13	D	*	979	1328	1127	1094
14	А	*	606	595	538	997
14	В	*	127	59	92	36
14	С	*	1470	675	2425	1438
14	D	*	66	153	69	123
15	А	*	199	115	373	738
15	В	*	51	3	6	25
15	С	*	137	4	20	23
15	D	*	26	32	39	6

*These plots were not counted on the 13th of May.

the mortality was set on 0. <i>Mortality black bean aphids (Aphis fabae) (%)</i>								
treatment	replicate	20 May	25 May	2 June	10 June			
1	A	98	99	96	85			
1	В	0	37	100	50			
1	С	0	100	78	88			
1	D	0	0	16	6			
2	A	0	0	0	0			
2	В	0	0	0	0			
2	С	0	0	0	0			
2	D	0	0	0	0			
3	A	73	99	100	100			
3	В	0	47	0	0			
3	С	0	98	78	93			
3	D	0	50	68	88			
4	A	95	98	93	89			
4	В	0	42	0	83			
4	С	88	99	93	95			
4	D	0	0	0	0			
5	A	49	100	98	84			
5	В	0	42	0	0			
5	С	44	98	73	96			
5	D	0	0	36	75			
6	A	59	85	100	98			
6	В	0	89	0	44			
6	С	0	99	94	97			
6	D	0	0	92	94			
7	А	68	100	97	92			
7	В	0	42	0	6			
7	С	20	99	100	96			
7	D	0	0	80	75			
8	А	91	100	94	91			
8	В	0	58	0	61			
8	С	0	50	95	78			
8	D	0	100	0	31			
9	Α	98	100	99	94			
9	В	60	95	0	83			
9	С	93	98	99	68			
9	D	0	100	64	100			
10	A	82	92	100	100			
10	В	0	0	0	0			
10	С	66	99	99	90			
10	D	0	0	16	0			

 Table F.2.
 Mortality (%) of black bean aphids (*Aphis fabae*) according to Abbott's formula at the field trial in Westmaas (2020). When a specific plot had more aphids then the control, the mortality was set on 0.

		Mortality black bean aphids (Aphis fabae) (%)						
treatment	replicate	20 May	25 May	2 June	10 June			
11	А	63	97	98	82			
11	В	0	68	0	6			
11	С	92	100	90	76			
11	D	0	100	80	0			
12	А	88	99	99	92			
12	В	0	26	0	0			
12	С	0	38	76	93			
12	D	57	50	64	0			

Annex G Raw data other aphids

Westmaas (2020).							
treatment	replicate		Number of a	other aphids	per 12 plar	ıts	
ireaimeni	replicale	13 May	20 May	25 May	2 June	10 June	
1	А	93	23	2	9	2	
1	В	158	37	0	4	0	
1	С	97	103	3	9	0	
1	D	32	44	1	0	1	
2	А	90	23	89	13	0	
2	В	91	33	9	6	2	
2	С	46	88	201	23	5	
2	D	30	46	12	7	5	
3	А	39	12	0	12	0	
3	В	92	113	0	4	3	
3	С	37	45	1	2	4	
3	D	64	31	0	5	1	
4	А	*	3	2	6	0	
4	В	*	34	0	0	1	
4	С	*	17	6	2	3	
4	D	*	19	3	1	1	
5	А	*	26	1	2	0	
5	В	*	32	2	2	0	
5	С	*	52	1	7	1	
5	D	*	7	1	1	0	
6	А	*	23	73	15	0	
6	В	*	22	4	2	4	
6	С	*	100	2	40	9	
6	D	*	16	4	1	1	
7	А	*	28	2	5	0	
7	В	*	13	0	0	0	
7	С	*	96	1	1	1	
7	D	*	11	0	5	10	
8	А	134	53	2	5	5	
8	В	59	3	0	2	5	
8	С	22	64	0	4	1	
8	D	36	21	0	1	1	
9	А	61	25	1	22	1	
9	В	56	17	0	4	1	
9	С	29	18	2	13	1	
9	D	33	4	0	4	0	
10	А	133	26	2	3	0	
10	В	86	31	3	0	0	
10	С	29	21	0	3	1	
10	D	24	15	0	1	1	

Table G.1.Number of other aphids per 12 plants at the field trial in
Westmaas (2020).

treatment	replicate		Number of o	ther aphids	per 12 plan	ıts
reumeni	терисие	13 May	20 May	25 May	2 June	10 June
11	А	96	35	2	0	0
11	В	67	53	7	5	3
11	С	43	25	0	10	0
11	D	17	12	0	0	1
12	А	183	19	5	3	0
12	В	63	8	0	2	1
12	С	66	31	2	4	0
12	D	66	21	1	0	2
13	А	*	75	194	15	1
13	В	*	21	11	3	10
13	С	*	65	24	13	5
13	D	*	93	3	11	5
14	А	*	38	30	4	0
14	В	*	17	1	2	3
14	С	*	39	91	14	35
14	D	*	88	1	1	2
15	А	*	46	83	15	10
15	В	*	123	16	1	5
15	С	*	43	19	29	0
15	D	*	68	16	1	2

*this plot was not counted on the 13th of May.

Annex H Raw data beneficials

Westmaas (2020).								
treatment	replicate		Number of b		er 12 plants			
	Ĩ	13 May	20 May	25 May	2 June	10 June		
1	А	7	3	9	4	2		
1	В	4	13	7	10	4		
1	С	0	8	9	6	13		
1	D	5	2	10	6	1		
2	А	6	8	29	22	16		
2	В	4	7	2	7	3		
2	С	3	9	28	20	25		
2	D	6	8	13	7	2		
3	А	2	8	7	4	3		
3	В	5	17	3	4	5		
3	С	1	16	8	6	4		
3	D	9	6	2	2	1		
4	А	*	4	7	9	7		
4	В	*	6	4	23	1		
4	С	*	10	5	3	4		
4	D	*	16	12	9	7		
5	А	*	6	18	7	4		
5	В	*	6	3	2	2		
5	С	*	7	6	3	6		
5	D	*	13	2	6	11		
6	А	*	5	23	10	5		
6	В	*	8	4	6	1		
6	С	*	12	14	9	7		
6	D	*	10	25	4	1		
7	А	*	6	12	2	8		
7	В	*	3	4	0	1		
7	С	*	6	11	4	12		
7	D	*	12	2	3	2		
8	А	4	40	6	6	3		
8	В	4	9	1	4	1		
8	С	2	8	19	8	4		
8	D	2	14	6	7	1		
9	А	6	10	12	2	2		
9	В	6	4	4	13	3		
9	С	0	5	6	9	8		
9	D	4	1	1	3	3		

Table H.1.Number of beneficials (eggs, larvae and adults of ladybird beetles, soldier beetles,
spiders, parasitic wasps, hoverflies, lacewings) per 12 plants at the field trial in
Westmaas (2020).

	nomligato		Number of b	eneficials pe	er 12 plants	7
treatment	replicate	13 May	20 May	25 May	2 June	10 June
10	А	4	9	5	4	4
10	В	5	8	4	7	2
10	С	3	25	6	4	2
10	D	2	11	7	3	3
11	А	4	4	11	5	5
11	В	8	7	7	15	4
11	С	4	8	4	6	5
11	D	6	8	10	5	1
12	А	3	6	14	4	8
12	В	10	4	5	4	6
12	С	4	12	16	12	15
12	D	5	6	2	2	3
13	А	*	12	91	27	11
13	В	*	7	6	3	1
13	С	*	8	17	9	15
13	D	*	13	40	18	7
14	А	*	7	36	28	14
14	В	*	7	5	10	4
14	С	*	10	25	17	6
14	D	*	10	21	9	7
15	А	*	4	14	9	12
15	В	*	16	15	4	9
15	С	*	9	17	9	6
15	D	*	5	10	8	7

*this plot was not counted on the 13th of May.

Annex I Raw data plant numbers and virus yellows

	_							
treatment	replicate	number of plants per plot	number o	f plants with vi plot	irus yellows per	perce	entage of plant yellows	
		28 May	6 July	11 August	11 September	6 July	11 August	11 Septembe
1	А	367	1	0	4	0.3	0.0	1.1
1	В	360	0	3	5	0.0	0.8	1.4
1	С	314	0	2	3	0.0	0.6	1.0
1	D	372	0	0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0
2	А	352	65	68	118	18.5	19.3	33.5
2	В	342	11	22	28	3.2	6.4	8.2
2	С	329	75	101	133	22.8	30.7	40.4
2	D	295	19	41	66	6.4	13.9	22.4
3	А	347	27	23	45	7.8	6.6	13.0
3	В	330	11	29	31	3.3	8.8	9.4
3	С	284	22	24	49	7.7	8.5	17.3
3	D	362	12	16	15	3.3	4.4	4.1
4	А	346	24	20	41	6.9	5.8	11.8
4	В	338	24	24	50	7.1	7.1	14.8
4	С	332	16	16	38	4.8	4.8	11.4
4	D	313	17	24	47	5.4	7.7	15.0
5	А	259	19	9	32	7.3	3.5	12.4
5	В	335	14	13	31	4.2	3.9	9.3
5	С	349	18	19	45	5.2	5.4	12.9
5	D	318	11	31	42	3.5	9.7	13.2
6	А	365	29	42	84	7.9	11.5	23.0
6	В	337	17	18	27	5.0	5.3	8.0
6	С	312	21	31	60	6.7	9.9	19.2
6	D	356	15	25	40	4.2	7.0	11.2
7	А	354	10	15	35	2.8	4.2	9.9
7	В	326	11	12	17	3.4	3.7	5.2
7	С	314	12	17	32	3.8	5.4	10.2
7	D	326	12	27	37	3.7	8.3	11.3
8	А	246	12	19	43	4.9	7.7	17.5
8	В	321	5	22	28	1.6	6.9	8.7
8	С	335	20	29	50	6.0	8.7	14.9
8	D	323	17	26	40	5.3	8.0	12.4
9	А	355	21	24	47	5.9	6.8	13.2
9	В	339	24	24	39	7.1	7.1	11.5
9	С	320	15	22	60	4.7	6.9	18.8
9	D	376	6	16	19	1.6	4.3	5.1

Table I.1.	Number of plants per plot, number of plants with virus yellows and percentage of plants with virus yellows at the field trial in Westmaas (2020).

treatment	replicate	number of plants per plot	number of	plants with vi plot	rus yellows per	percentage of plants with virus yellows			
		28 May	6 July	11 August	11 September	6 July	11 August	11 September	
10	А	365	20	28	56	5.5	7.7	15.3	
10	В	342	25	20	41	7.3	5.8	12.0	
10	С	360	14	12	31	3.9	3.3	8.6	
10	D	364	9	9	22	2.5	2.5	6.0	
11	А	337	14	22	35	4.2	6.5	10.4	
11	В	329	28	36	53	8.5	10.9	16.1	
11	С	272	24	22	46	8.8	8.1	16.9	
11	D	338	8	11	15	2.4	3.3	4.4	
12	А	362	20	26	65	5.5	7.2	18.0	
12	В	362	14	24	38	3.9	6.6	10.5	
12	С	345	22	47	54	6.4	13.6	15.7	
12	D	334	6	15	18	1.8	4.5	5.4	
13	А	354	61	103	141	17.2	29.1	39.8	
13	В	338	15	49	57	4.4	14.5	16.9	
13	С	299	39	53	71	13.0	17.7	23.7	
13	D	308	41	57	91	13.3	18.5	29.5	
14	А	329	106	123	187	32.2	37.4	56.8	
14	В	352	26	34	60	7.4	9.7	17.0	
14	С	281	41	48	69	14.6	17.1	24.6	
14	D	321	24	40	64	7.5	12.5	19.9	
15	А	312	50	75	114	16.0	24.0	36.5	
15	В	315	24	51	59	7.6	16.2	18.7	
15	С	227	51	69	101	22.5	30.4	44.5	
15	D	331	32	42	66	9.7	12.7	19.9	

Raw data phytotoxicity Annex J

A

В

С

D

(2020).Number of plants with phytotox symptoms replicate treatment 20 May 25 May 2 June 10 June 6 July 11 August 11 September A В С D A В С D A В С D А В С D A В С D A В С D A В С D А В С D A В С D

Table J.1. Number of plants per plot with phytotox symptoms at the field trial in Westmaas

treatment	replicate			Number o	f plants wi	th phytoto	x symptoms	
ireaimeni	replicule	20 May	25 May	2 June	10 June	6 July	11 August	11 September
11	А	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
11	В	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
11	С	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
11	D	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
12	А	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
12	В	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
12	С	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
12	D	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
13	А	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
13	В	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
13	С	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
13	D	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
14	А	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
14	В	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
14	С	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
14	D	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
15	А	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
15	В	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
15	С	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
15	D	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Annex K Weather data

date	air temperature max	air temperature min	air temperature average	% humidity max	% humidity min	% humidity average	precipi- tation total (mm)	wind- speed (m/s)
20200301	8.5	5.0	6.3	85	71	79	0.7	8.5
20200301	8.0	0.3	5.3	95	84	90	6.5	4.1
20200302	9.1	0.1	5.1	93	66	83	1.2	4.5
20200303	10.2	3.1	7.2	95	53	78	0.3	3.5
20200305	6.9	4.9	5.6	96	87	93	16.9	5.5
20200306	8.8	3.7	6.4	94	79	86	5.3	4.7
20200307	10.8	0.6	6.9	94	65	79	0.2	5.5
20200308	10.8	7.1	8.7	93	77	84	0.4	7.5
20200309	10.4	6.3	7.8	92	74	83	3.9	6.2
20200310	11.5	6.6	10.2	96	91	94	15.4	10.0
20200311	13.0	9.3	11.0	95	76	87	2.0	7.3
20200312	10.8	6.7	8.4	88	56	69	0.5	10.6
20200313	10.0	2.3	6.8	98	71	83	2.3	5.5
20200314	11.6	1.1	7.2	99	60	83	0.3	4.8
20200315	11.3	7.2	9.5	90	71	80	0.0	5.9
20200316	12.6	2.2	7.2	99	65	86	0.0	2.2
20200317	12.8	2.8	8.6	97	43	71	0.0	5.5
20200318	13.2	6.2	10.0	95	55	73	0.0	5.5
20200319	10.0	6.7	8.4	99	79	90	0.0	3.3
20200320	8.8	3.5	6.8	88	61	76	< 0.1	5.8
20200321	9.7	0.6	5.0	91	51	65	0.0	7.1
20200322	9.7	-0.4	4.8	75	39	55	0.0	6.8
20200323	10.0	0.0	5.4	63	27	43	0.0	5.9
20200324	11.9	-2.8	6.6	70	24	38	0.0	4.4
20200325	12.1	0.4	6.1	60	24	41	0.0	4.0
20200326	11.4	-1.4	6.0	72	30	48	0.0	4.7
20200327	13.7	1.9	7.9	77	43	60	0.0	5.2
20200328	11.9	4.6	7.7	77	49	65	0.0	6.6
20200329	7.4	-0.7	4.6	79	33	53	0.1	8.0
20200330	9.7	-2.0	4.2	89	62	77	1.8	2.9
20200331	9.2	-0.1	4.3	93	37	66	0.0	3.5
20200401	8.6	-2.4	4.4	97	54	75	0.0	1.4
20200402	10.7	1.9	7.7	88	53	75	0.6	5.0
20200403	10.3	2.5	7.1	88	47	72	0.0	4.0
20200404	15.0	1.9	9.1	84	36	54	0.0	3.4
20200405	20.9	5.0	13.9	68	26	45	0.0	4.8
20200406	20.6	5.9	13.5	91	41	60	< 0.1	5.2
20200407	18.6	3.7	12.6	98	38	66	0.0	2.9
20200408	23.1	7.3	14.9	93	42	68	0.0	1.8
20200409	20.2	6.4	13.3	98	46	70	0.0	2.8
20200410	18.4	4.8	11.5	89	48	65	0.0	3.5

Table K.1. Weather data from the nearest KNMI weather station (Rotterdam).

date	air temperature max	air temperature min	air temperature average	% humidity max	% humidity min	% humidity average	precipi- tation total (mm)	wind- speed (m/s)
20200411	20.4	5.1	12.7	92	25	53	0.0	2.1
20200412	22.3	5.0	14.0	97	41	67	< 0.1	2.3
20200413	11.0	5.5	7.9	82	45	58	< 0.1	6.6
20200414	10.0	2.3	6.2	91	53	69	0.1	2.5
20200415	16.1	0.3	8.3	95	38	70	0.0	1.5
20200416	21.0	3.7	12.6	97	33	66	0.0	2.9
20200417	16.1	6.2	10.7	82	51	68	0.0	5.8
20200418	13.9	5.9	10.2	94	59	80	1.9	2.7
20200419	18.1	7.5	11.7	87	33	56	1.2	4.9
20200420	18.5	5.5	12.7	57	29	42	0.0	7.5
20200421	19.6	8.3	14.0	54	30	42	0.0	7.5
20200422	21.4	7.2	14.4	69	27	47	0.0	5.7
20200423	22.4	6.7	14.3	98	28	60	0.0	2.3
20200424	18.0	6.4	11.6	98	42	71	0.0	3.1
20200425	13.5	4.5	9.1	88	54	68	0.0	3.0
20200426	15.7	1.4	8.7	98	54	78	0.0	1.5
20200427	19.8	2.8	12.1	98	33	71	0.0	2.3
20200428	10.2	7.8	9.1	96	85	91	4.4	3.4
20200429	15.7	7.9	11.6	97	65	83	3.2	4.6
20200430	16.5	8.6	11.5	88	42	71	2.4	6.9
20200501	14.1	8.7	10.6	90	65	80	5.5	6.5
20200502	13.7	7.4	10.7	90	65	76	0.0	4.5
20200503	17.1	8.0	12.6	91	48	74	0.5	2.6
20200504	16.0	5.3	11.3	94	48	72	0.5	4.2
20200505	14.4	3.8	9.5	89	44	64	0.0	4.4
20200506	17.3	3.1	10.7	91 07	32	64	0.0	3.0
20200507	20.1	4.1	13.0	97 08	32	61	0.0	1.6
20200508	21.9	6.3 7.8	15.0	98 07	30 22	61 50	0.0	1.5
20200509 20200510	24.8 22.1	7.8 7.9	17.5 13.4	97 89	32 49	59 70	0.0 0.0	3.5 5.3
20200510	12.7	3.7	13.4 8.5	89 85	49 35	70 51	0.0	5.5 7.4
20200511	12.7	2.4	8.3 8.2	83 90	35 36	51 65	<0.1	2.3
20200512	13.2	3.2	8.2 8.1	90 95	30 45	63 62	<0.1 0.0	2.3 4.4
20200513	12.3	1.0	7.9	82	45 46	59	0.0	4.4
20200514	15.2	0.4	9.6	91	48	66	0.0	2.0
20200515	15.5	4.6	10.5	98	52	73	0.0	3.5
20200510	18.8	5.8	13.3	98 98	32	63	0.0	3.8
20200517	20.0	10.0	14.9	87	40	66	0.0	4.5
20200510	20.8	10.0	15.7	98	58	75	0.0	2.8
20200519	22.9	10.0	17.0	98	46	70	0.0	2.1
20200520	27.2	10.7	20.2	91	36	61	0.0	1.8
20200522	23.4	14.3	18.9	84	29	57	0.2	7.2
20200523	18.9	12.9	14.9	82	48	67	0.0	7.9
20200524	15.6	11.7	13.7	89	66	78	0.8	4.9

date	air temperature max	air temperature min	air temperature average	% humidity max	% humidity min	% humidity average	precipi- tation total (mm)	wind- speed (m/s)
20200525	20.2	8.8	15.2	98	52	71	<0.1	2.7
20200526	23.6	8.3	16.3	98	39	67	0.0	2.0
20200527	21.2	11.0	15.2	94	42	69	0.0	3.3
20200528	20.3	8.8	14.7	77	29	55	0.0	5.3
20200529	22.0	6.0	15.2	89	33	60	0.0	3.9
20200530	24.6	8.0	17.5	85	28	53	0.0	4.3
20200531	23.2	11.2	17.5	84	33	53	0.0	5.1
20200601	24.4	10.0	18.4	93	33	57	0.0	3.6
20200602	26.2	10.9	18.3	98	35	67	0.0	2.1
20200603	21.6	10.8	16.2	98	46	76	0.0	3.5
20200604	16.7	7.9	12.7	90	70	78	0.7	4.6
20200605	14.2	6.2	10.4	94	64	81	16.8	5.1
20200606	16.5	8.0	11.8	91	43	70	7.3	7.9
20200607	15.8	9.4	12.3	95	65	83	5.8	4.5
20200608	17.8	10.8	13.7	98	66	80	2.1	3.5
20200609	16.5	7.6	12.7	91	54	67	0.0	3.0
20200610	17.7	6.7	13.5	94	58	79	< 0.1	1.6
20200611	18.6	12.4	15.1	95	71	85	1.5	2.8
20200612	26.7	12.3	18.7	97	44	78	17.5	4.0
20200613	25.1	15.1	19.8	97	49	76	0.9	2.7
20200614	20.5	14.3	17.4	98	66	85	26.1	2.2
20200615	24.2	14.8	19.3	87	52	68	< 0.1	2.5
20200616	23.1	15.1	18.1	96	67	83	2.5	2.1
20200617	25.2	13.7	19.4	98	48	78	30.6	3.1
20200618	23.0	13.2	17.4	99	56	84	10.0	3.0
20200619	21.7	11.4	16.9	99	59	77	0.0	3.6
20200620	21.5	12.6	17.4	92	52	71	0.0	2.8
20200621	24.7	14.8	18.7	92	55	69	0.0	5.1
20200622	21.6	12.0	17.4	98	46	67	0.0	2.5
20200623	25.2	11.3	19.8	94	45	63	0.0	2.0
20200624	30.1	14.8	23.3	90	34	56	0.0	3.8
20200625	29.5	16.9	24.6	68	39	53	0.0	5.0
20200626	30.9	19.6	24.3	87	39	64	0.6	3.3
20200627	24.5	17.7	20.0	94	63	77	1.6	5.5
20200628	21.5	14.8	17.6	72	46	61	< 0.1	8.0
20200629	19.6	14.0	16.2	79	51	66	0.1	9.0
20200630	19.7	14.7	16.5	97	61	81	12.2	6.9
20200701	20.9	15.6	17.8	92	63	79	0.6	6.2
20200702	20.3	15.0	17.4	89	57	77	0.1	5.4
20200703	21.4	11.9	17.3	94	46	72	< 0.1	7.0
20200704	19.0	14.5	16.8	95	80	90	10.8	8.9
20200705	20.9	15.4	17.6	91	59	79	0.0	10.0
20200706	18.5	10.0	14.4	96	62	74	0.5	5.8
20200707	19.4	10.0	15.5	96	58	76	1.5	3.3

date	air temperature max	air temperature min	air temperature average	% humidity max	% humidity min	% humidity average	precipi- tation total (mm)	wind- speed (m/s)
20200708	18.4	13.4	15.9	97	82	91	5.5	2.4
20200709	18.2	15.9	17.1	97	87	92	6.4	6.1
20200710	18.1	10.4	15.1	98	60	81	4.8	3.4
20200711	19.4	9.1	14.6	97	60	80	0.6	2.5
20200712	20.4	8.5	15.2	99	54	73	0.0	1.7
20200713	22.6	9.0	17.8	98	39	64	0.0	1.9
20200714	18.1	11.2	15.9	95	73	86	7.8	2.4
20200715	20.4	9.7	16.1	97	58	76	0.0	2.3
20200716	20.2	14.5	16.6	96	72	86	2.6	3.1
20200717	23.4	14.4	18.4	96	56	81	< 0.1	1.5
20200718	25.4	13.6	19.5	97	63	78	0.0	2.9
20200719	22.7	12.3	17.1	99	65	85	3.2	2.6
20200720	20.3	10.1	15.3	96	49	74	0.0	2.8
20200721	20.7	8.8	15.2	97	52	71	0.0	2.7
20200722	20.1	9.5	15.5	97	40	67	0.0	1.8
20200723	24.6	12.2	18.9	81	42	60	0.0	4.1
20200724	21.9	15.9	18.6	90	63	78	0.6	3.5
20200725	22.5	16.2	18.3	98	70	87	29.4	5.0
20200726	21.3	16.2	18.5	92	56	73	1.7	5.6
20200727	26.1	15.6	19.0	85	52	73	0.1	5.4
20200728	20.2	15.4	17.8	85	58	67	< 0.1	5.7
20200729	20.7	12.1	16.5	84	54	67	0.0	3.4
20200730	25.9	12.7	19.9	85	37	61	0.0	2.1
20200731	32.2	14.5	25.3	83	31	52	0.2	4.0
20200801	24.2	16.0	20.3	91	58	79	0.3	3.8
20200802	21.4	12.7	17.7	92	52	73	0.0	3.0
20200803	19.1	11.7	15.6	97	68	83	4.1	2.1
20200804	21.9	9.4	17.2	97	43	65	0.0	2.4
20200805	27.6	15.1	20.8	83	32	58	0.0	4.3
20200806	29.2	15.3	22.3	93	38	68	0.0	2.0
20200807	32.9	16.5	25.3	97	27	61	0.0	1.7
20200808	33.8	16.9	26.5	96	27	57	0.0	2.1
20200809	31.6	20.3	26.1	87	50	67	0.0	3.4
20200810	32.4	19.0	25.6	88	40	65	< 0.1	3.2
20200811	32.5	19.4	25.9	83	48	65	0.0	2.5
20200812	31.6	20.1	26.6	87	47	64	0.0	3.0
20200813	31.4	20.2	25.0	96	53	75	1.5	2.3
20200814	28.1	18.5	22.0	97	58	84	<0.1	2.5
20200815	27.3	17.3	21.8	98	57	82	10.5	1.7
20200816	29.8	17.1	22.4	98	53	83	4.7	2.8
20200817	24.7	16.0	19.7	98	65	86	2.7	2.3
20200818	23.0	15.3	18.9	93	57	80	1.4	3.5
20200819	27.7	15.6	21.7	95	49 50	72	1.9	4.6
20200820	28.9	19.2	23.2	94	59	81	0.7	3.5

date	air temperature max	air temperature min	air temperature average	% humidity max	% humidity min	% humidity average	precipi- tation total (mm)	wind- speed (m/s)
20200821	27.4	18.9	23.6	75	46	63	<0.1	6.1
20200821	22.2	17.2	19.4	88	58	73	1.5	8.0
20200822	20.9	15.0	17.9	94	64	78	6.2	5.9
20200823	20.9	14.2	17.3	95	60	78	5.5	4.3
20200824	21.8	15.4	17.5	93 94	65	82	3.0	7.6
20200825	18.9	12.2	16.9	93	71	79	4.1	9.1
20200820	20.7	13.5	17.1	97	63	81	1.7	3.1
20200828	20.7	14.2	16.8	89	66	81	7.3	5.4
20200820	18.9	12.7	15.2	97	76	89	7.7	3.6
20200829	18.9	12.3	15.6	98	70	85	1.8	4.2
20200830	18.7	8.8	14.3	97	55	74	0.0	2.1
20200031	18.2	9.2	13.8	97	61	82	0.0	1.3
20200901	20.6	6.8	14.5	98	57	80	0.0	1.5
20200902	20.6	13.6	17.3	98	76	87	9.5	6.3
20200903	20.5	15.4	17.4	95	60	79	0.3	4.6
20200901	18.4	10.3	15.1	96	59	78	4.6	3.3
20200906	19.2	9.2	14.6	98	58	79	0.5	2.7
20200907	20.9	10.6	16.3	99	58	78	0.0	4.0
20200908	19.2	15.9	17.7	97	81	89	<0.1	4.2
20200909	21.6	9.6	17.3	97	74	89	0.1	3.9
20200909	19.4	9.1	14.2	99	55	79	0.0	1.0
20200910	19.7	11.3	15.0	98	54	77	0.0	1.8
20200911	19.6	12.4	15.9	95	69	83	0.0	4.0
20200912	21.9	12.8	17.2	99	65	84	0.0	3.4
20200914	28.2	10.6	19.4	99	42	78	0.0	1.8
20200915	32.2	12.7	22.2	98	42	74	0.0	1.5
20200916	23.1	13.2	18.4	99	64	83	0.0	3.7
20200917	19.4	8.5	13.8	97	44	71	0.0	4.3
20200918	21.5	6.3	13.7	86	44	69	0.0	4.6
20200919	23.3	6.9	15.4	89	42	67	0.0	3.5
20200920	21.9	9.0	14.8	96	45	70	0.0	3.5
20200921	24.1	6.6	14.9	99	35	79	0.0	1.4
20200922	22.9	7.4	15.3	99	45	78	0.0	1.3
20200923	20.8	14.6	16.9	94	66	87	22.0	4.8
20200924	17.2	11.4	13.9	86	62	78	1.4	6.8
20200925	13.2	7.8	11.3	97	75	86	12.9	6.8
20200926	16.8	8.1	12.9	95	68	84	12.0	3.3
20200927	17.0	13.3	14.9	98	74	87	5.4	5.0
20200928	16.8	13.5	15.2	98	95	98	15.1	1.8
20200929	18.8	13.2	15.7	98	57	82	3.2	2.6
20200930	19.1	12.0	15.8	98	77	88	1.2	4.0

Annex L Raw data yield assessment

treatment	replicate	root weight (ton/ha)	percentage of sugar	sugar weight (ton/ha)	soil tare (%)	potassium (mmol/kg)	sodium content (mmol/kg)	amino nitrogen (mmol/kg)	financial yield (€/ha)
1	А	112.5	16.09	18.1	2.3	36.8	2.6	13.9	3554
1	В	126.8	16.33	20.7	1.6	37.0	2.6	12.8	4129
1	С	121.8	16.24	19.8	1.8	38.8	2.6	12.0	3924
1	D	125.9	16.31	20.5	1.9	36.4	2.4	13.9	4080
2	А	107.2	16.01	17.2	2.2	35.4	2.6	13.0	3373
2	В	121.5	16.12	19.6	2.4	36.6	2.8	14.0	3851
2	С	109.9	15.85	17.4	3.3	35.1	2.4	12.6	3385
2	D	112.7	15.95	18.0	1.8	36.5	2.6	11.7	3529
3	А	122.3	16.59	20.3	2.4	31.7	2.3	12.8	4103
3	В	113.7	15.65	17.8	1.5	35.5	2.9	13.6	3443
3	С	115.2	16.03	18.5	2.3	38.0	2.7	13.7	3613
3	D	119.5	16.26	19.4	1.7	36.2	2.4	10.8	3876
4	А	119.4	16.27	19.4	2.1	36.2	2.5	11.6	3867
4	В	120.1	16.10	19.3	2.3	36.1	2.6	13.1	3808
4	С	119.4	16.06	19.2	2.0	36.7	2.3	12.2	3775
4	D	115.7	15.86	18.4	2.2	35.7	2.9	15.1	3565
5	А	128.1	16.44	21.1	2.0	34.5	2.2	11.4	4233
5	В	121.7	15.95	19.4	2.2	34.9	2.7	13.1	3805
5	С	124.7	17.00	21.2	2.0	37.5	2.5	13.8	4325
5	D	107.8	15.73	17.0	1.9	36.8	2.9	12.6	3286
6	А	112.7	16.61	18.7	2.7	33.4	2.3	10.5	3787
6	В	114.3	16.13	18.4	1.8	37.6	2.5	12.2	3644
6	С	107.5	16.15	17.4	2.0	36.6	2.6	13.2	3427
6	D	121.7	16.06	19.5	2.2	34.7	2.4	12.4	3853
7	А	128.7	16.49	21.2	2.4	36.3	2.2	11.6	4256
7	В	112.6	16.07	18.1	2.0	37.2	2.8	14.3	3551
7	С	119.2	16.31	19.5	2.0	36.7	2.5	12.5	3874
7	D	108.0	16.35	17.6	2.2	34.2	2.4	10.6	3536
8	А	119.8	16.30	19.5	3.2	35.2	2.7	10.8	3882
8	В	114.7	15.79	18.1	2.1	36.7	3.0	13.7	3511
8	С	123.3	16.09	19.8	2.8	37.5	2.5	12.7	3893
8	D	112.3	16.61	18.7	2.2	37.1	2.4	11.0	3766
9	А	113.5	16.30	18.5	1.6	35.4	2.4	11.6	3699
9	В	109.8	15.88	17.4	1.4	35.9	2.6	12.2	3421
9	С	120.6	16.13	19.5	2.1	36.4	2.5	12.0	3846
9	D	123.3	16.37	20.2	1.6	36.0	2.5	12.0	4040
10	А	125.4	16.85	21.1	1.9	35.1	2.5	12.1	4312
10	В	118.3	15.95	18.9	2.2	36.6	2.6	15.3	3677
10	С	120.5	16.69	20.1	1.6	34.6	2.2	10.4	4095
10	D	127.0	16.16	20.5	0.5	34.2	2.5	12.5	4097

Table L.1.Harvest data of the field trial in Westmaas (18th of September, 2020).

treatment	replicate	root weight (ton/ha)	percentage of sugar	sugar weight (ton/ha)	soil tare (%)	potassium (mmol/kg)	sodium content (mmol/kg)	amino nitrogen (mmol/kg)	financial yield (€/ha)
11	А	114.8	16.10	18.5	2.3	35.6	2.4	12.5	3648
11	В	109.3	15.23	16.7	2.8	35.1	3.4	14.5	3129
11	С	119.0	15.94	19.0	1.2	39.4	2.8	12.9	3714
11	D	125.0	16.84	21.1	1.8	34.2	2.5	12.0	4300
12	А	118.6	16.62	19.7	4.8	36.4	2.1	11.0	3943
12	В	123.7	15.83	19.6	2.8	37.5	2.7	15.3	3777
12	С	115.7	16.09	18.6	2.4	34.2	2.6	12.0	3679
12	D	109.4	16.19	17.7	2.4	34.9	2.5	12.3	3510
13	А	113.8	15.74	17.9	2.0	33.9	2.6	13.3	3479
13	В	115.1	15.43	17.8	2.6	35.5	3.1	14.7	3370
13	С	104.5	15.45	16.1	2.8	38.8	2.9	15.4	3048
13	D	111.0	15.51	17.2	2.3	38.0	2.8	15.8	3272
14	А	101.3	15.13	15.3	2.7	36.8	3.0	14.9	2858
14	В	110.7	15.56	17.2	2.1	35.7	2.9	13.4	3310
14	С	99.4	15.78	15.7	2.6	37.9	2.5	13.6	3031
14	D	116.5	15.43	18.0	2.8	38.4	2.9	16.3	3391
15	А	109.5	15.58	17.1	3.1	36.0	2.5	13.6	3266
15	В	113.9	15.85	18.1	2.2	37.5	2.7	12.2	3516
15	С	110.3	15.83	17.4	3.1	45.1	4.6	23.1	3279
15	D	115.6	15.72	18.2	1.9	34.6	2.7	12.5	3533